

# Statistical mechanics of relativistic anyon-like systems \*

Suzhou Huang

*Department of Physics, FM-15, University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98195*

*and Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science and Department of Physics  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

Bernd Schreiber

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science and Department of Physics  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

(February 6, 2008)

## Abstract

To study the manifestation of the Aharonov-Bohm effect in many-body systems we consider the statistical mechanics of the Gross-Neveu model on a ring (1+1 dimensions) and on a cylinder (2+1 dimensions) with a thin solenoid coinciding with the axis. For such systems with a non-trivial magnetic flux ( $\theta$ ) many thermodynamical observables, such as the order parameter, induced current and virial coefficients, display periodic but non-analytic dependence on  $\theta$ . In the 2+1 dimensional case we further find that there is an interval of  $\theta \in (1/3, 2/3)$  (modulo integers) where parity is always spontaneously broken, independent of the circumference of the cylinder. We show that the mean-field character of the phase transitions is preserved to the leading order in  $1/N$ , by verifying the  $\theta$ -independence of all the critical exponents. The precise nature of the quasi-particle, locally fermion-like and globally anyon-like, is illuminated through the calculation of the equal-time commutator and the decomposition of the propagator into a sum over paths classified by winding numbers.

---

\*This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U. S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under contracts #DE-FG06-88ER40427, #DE-AC02-76ER03069 and by a Feodor-Lynen-Fellowship of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation (B.S.).

## I. INTRODUCTION

Due to their direct relevance to the quantum Hall effect [1], possible connection with high temperature superconductivity [2] as well as their intellectual challenges, anyon systems have attracted enormous attention in the past several years. Almost exclusively, the formulation of anyons is based on the idea of the Chern-Simons construction. In this formulation anyons are locally so-called charge-flux tube composites. Physically, the essence involved is nothing but the famous Aharonov-Bohm effect [3]. It is the interference of the gauge field, (which would be a pure gauge when totally isolated), associated with each particle that modifies the statistics of the particle such that it interpolates between the boson and fermion limits. While it is conceptually more satisfactory, the involvement of the Chern-Simons term, because of its technical complexity, makes the understanding of anyon properties rather difficult, especially in many-anyon systems.

In this paper we study a system which in many ways captures the main features of anyons, while avoiding the inclusion of the Chern-Simons term. In a topologically simple configuration space it would be necessary to include the Chern-Simons term to implement the fractional statistics. However, when the configuration space becomes topologically non-trivial, there is no need to add terms other than the minimal coupling between the gauge and the matter fields in order to achieve the desired interference. Thus with the slight complication of introducing a topologically non-trivial configuration space, the procedure of setting up a system which displays anyon-like behavior is greatly simplified and one can study typical effects such as the periodic but non-analytic dependence of thermodynamical observables on the statistics parameter. It is this technical simplification which allowed us to carry out our study of the thermodynamics of such a system rather explicitly, using conventional methods. We hope that our results will shed some light on the thermodynamics of Chern-Simons anyon systems.

The specific model we consider is the Gross-Neveu model [4] with an external constant gauge potential defined by

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}[i\partial_\mu - a_\mu(\theta)]\gamma^\mu\psi + \frac{g^2}{2N}(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2, \quad (1)$$

on a ring (1+1 dimensions) and on a cylinder (2+1 dimensions) with  $x$ -direction compactified (of length  $L$ ) to the leading order in  $1/N$ . The  $\psi$ -field is a two-component Dirac spinor and implicitly has  $N$  components in the internal space. The external gauge field  $a_\mu(\theta)$  is generated by a thin solenoid of magnetic flux  $2\pi\theta$  which coincides with the axis of the ring or cylinder, that is,  $a_1(\theta) = 2\pi\theta/L$  and all other components vanish. Since the Lagrangian is fermionic when  $\theta = 0$ , the anti-periodic boundary condition in  $x$ -direction,  $\psi(x+L) = -\psi(x)$ , is naturally imposed. Without losing generality we only need to consider  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ , for the integral part of  $\theta$  can be safely gauge-transformed away. The periodic dependence of physical quantities on  $\theta$  is obvious.

The geometric setting here is such that the particles move in a multi-connected configuration space. Due to the presence of the magnetic flux, we anticipate that the Aharonov-Bohm effect will have a profound impact on the statistical mechanics of the system. It is possible to formally remove the gauge field in Eq.(1) via a gauge transformation  $\psi \rightarrow \exp(i2\pi\theta x/L)\psi \equiv \psi'$ . However, the expense of eliminating the gauge field is that

the new field  $\psi'$  becomes multi-valued (when  $\theta \neq 0$  or  $1/2$ ). The magnetic flux can be regarded as an external means of varying the boundary condition. It should be emphasized that, like in the original Aharonov-Bohm experiment, the magnetic field on the ring or cylinder is zero. Therefore, the effect of  $\theta \neq 0$  is purely quantum mechanical in nature, taking the advantage of  $L$  being finite. In the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  all the  $\theta$ -dependence of physical observables should disappear, since then the effect of the boundary condition becomes irrelevant. It is also easy to see that single particle states have smooth  $\theta$ -dependence and that the non-analyticity of physical observables arises only from many-body effects.

Before we dwell into details, let us comment on the choice of the specific microscopic Lagrangian, Eq.(1). In our opinion, the precise underlying dynamics is not too crucial, as long as the qualitative features, such as the existence of a phase transition, are present. Therefore, the choice is simply dictated by convenience. However, it should be pointed out that the Gross-Neveu type of Lagrangians do have some relevance to certain condensed matter systems or models. For example, the Gross-Neveu model in 1+1 dimensions is closely related to the continuum limit of the one dimensional Hubbard model at half-filling and the quantum spin-one-half antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain [5], while in 2+1 dimensions it models the continuum limit of the so-called chiral spin liquid [6]. Although we do not directly address questions on how to make observations in some specifically designed experiments, one should always keep these issues in mind.

The Lagrangian in Eq.(1) possesses discrete symmetries. In the 1+1 dimensional case, the symmetry is the chiral symmetry

$$\psi(x, t) \rightarrow e^{i\gamma_5\pi/2}\psi(x, t), \quad (2)$$

whereas in the 2+1 dimensional case, the relevant symmetry is parity

$$\psi(x, y, t) \rightarrow i\gamma_2\psi(x, -y, t). \quad (3)$$

Since the operator  $\bar{\psi}\psi$  changes sign under either Eq.(2) or Eq.(3), the order parameters are the ensemble averages  $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ . In other words, when a mass term is generated, the discrete symmetry, the chiral symmetry in 1+1 dimensions or parity in 2+1 dimensions, is dynamically broken. Because of the discrete nature of the symmetry involved, there will be no Goldstone mode associated with the dynamical symmetry breaking in our model. For convenience, we introduce a scalar auxiliary field  $\sigma$ , which interpolates the composite operator  $-g^2\bar{\psi}\psi$ . Then the Lagrangian in Eq.(1) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}[i\partial_\mu - a_\mu(\theta)]\gamma^\mu\psi - \frac{N}{2g^2}\sigma^2 - \sigma\bar{\psi}\psi. \quad (4)$$

Note that the  $\sigma$ -field obeys periodic boundary conditions for any value of  $\theta$ , though it is odd under the transformations Eq.(2) or Eq.(3).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the result in 1+1 dimensions, along with its relevance to Lüscher's small-volume expansion in asymptotically free field theories with phase transitions. In section III we present the result in 2+1 dimensions, in a manner suited for possible verification in condensed matter experiments. To further reveal the effect of  $\theta$  on the phase transition, we compute in section IV all the critical

exponents and verify that the phase transitions remain in the universality class of mean-field type to leading order in  $1/N$ . The anyonic character of the quasi-particle is demonstrated in section V via an explicit calculation of the relevant propagators and commutators. Finally, we summarize and point out possible generalizations in section VI.

## II. RESULTS IN 1+1 DIMENSIONS

To leading order in  $1/N$  the effective potential for the  $\sigma$ -field is given by the standard one-loop formula, in dimensional regularization,

$$V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta] = N \left[ \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon} \sigma^2}{2g_B^2} - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu^{2\epsilon} \int \frac{d^{1-2\epsilon} \omega}{(2\pi)^{1-2\epsilon}} \ln(\omega^2 + \tilde{k}_n^2 + \sigma^2) \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $\tilde{k}_n = k_n + 2\pi\theta/L$  and  $k_n = \pi(2n+1)/L$ . Since an additive constant in  $V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta]$  is irrelevant, we can first calculate

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta]}{\partial \sigma} = N\sigma \left[ \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon}}{g_B^2} - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu^{2\epsilon} \int \frac{d^{1-2\epsilon} \omega}{(2\pi)^{1-2\epsilon}} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + \tilde{k}_n^2 + \sigma^2} \right]. \quad (6)$$

After some straightforward manipulation we obtain explicitly

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta]}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{N\sigma}{\pi} \left[ \frac{\pi \mu^{2\epsilon}}{g_B^2} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \gamma_E - \ln 4\pi + \ln(\mu^2 L^2) \right) - C_0(\theta) - \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} C_{2\nu}(\theta) (\sigma L)^{2\nu} \right], \quad (7)$$

where

$$C_0(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \zeta(1+\nu) \left[ (1/2+\theta)^\nu + (1/2-\theta)^\nu \right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{1/2-\theta}{n(n-1/2+\theta)} + \frac{1/2+\theta}{n(n-1/2-\theta)} \right], \quad (8)$$

and

$$C_{2\nu}(\theta) = \frac{(-1)^\nu}{2} \binom{2\nu}{\nu} \left( \frac{1}{4\pi} \right)^{2\nu} \left[ \zeta(2\nu+1, 1/2+\theta) + \zeta(2\nu+1, 1/2-\theta) \right]. \quad (9)$$

In the above equation  $\gamma_E$  is the Euler-Mascheroni constant and  $\zeta(\alpha, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+z)^{-\alpha}$  is the generalized Riemann Zeta function. By further choosing the modified minimal subtraction scheme, the final result for the renormalized effective potential is then given by

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta]}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{N\sigma}{\pi} \left[ -\ln(ML) - \gamma_E + \ln 4\pi - C_0(\theta) - \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} C_{2\nu}(\theta) (\sigma L)^{2\nu} \right], \quad (10)$$

where  $M$  is a shorthand notation for the standard  $\Lambda_{\overline{\text{MS}}}$ . Since the convergence radius of the series in  $\sigma L$  in the above equation is  $2\pi$ , it is sometimes necessary to use the integral representation of the series

$$C_0(\theta) + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} C_{2\nu}(\theta) z^{2\nu} = \ln 4\pi - \gamma_E - \ln z + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n \cos(2\pi n\theta) \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t} \exp(-z^2 t - \frac{n^2}{4t}), \quad (11)$$

in Eq.(10).

The mass gap is solved from  $\partial V_{\text{eff}}(\sigma = m)/\partial \sigma = 0$ , yielding

$$m(L, \theta) = \begin{cases} M \exp \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n \cos(2\pi n\theta) \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t} \exp(-z^2 t - n^2/4t) \right], & \text{when } L > L_c(\theta), \\ 0, & \text{when } L < L_c(\theta), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where  $z \equiv m(L, \theta)L$  and  $L_c(\theta)$  is the critical length of the ring defined by

$$L_c(\theta) = \frac{\pi}{M} \exp \left[ -\gamma_E + \ln 4 - C_0(\theta) \right]. \quad (13)$$

As defined in Eq.(8)  $C_0(\theta)$  is a monotonically increasing function of  $\theta \in [0, 1/2)$  starting at  $C_0(0) = \ln 4$  and diverging at  $\theta = 1/2$ . Thus the longest critical length results when  $\theta = 0$ ,  $L_c(0) = \pi \exp(-\gamma_E)/M \approx 1.7639/M$ , and the shortest critical length is zero,  $L_c(1/2) = 0$ . For other values of  $\theta$  the critical length interpolates continuously between these two extrema. In Fig.1 we plot  $m(L, \theta)$  as a function of  $1/L$  for several values of  $\theta$ .

The non-trivial dependence of the mass gap on  $\theta$  and  $L$  has an interesting implication with respect to the small-volume expansion, proposed by Lüscher [7,8], for asymptotically free theories with phase transitions. Lüscher's approach is based on the observation that when the volume is small, the running coupling becomes small due to asymptotic freedom, and perturbative calculations can then be applied. The physical result is finally obtained by doing a sequence of calculations with increasing volumes and extrapolating to the infinite volume limit. However, there are some obstacles in doing the infinite volume extrapolation. One is due to the existence of instantons, mostly addressed so far in the literature [9]. The other is related to the existence of phase transitions, such as the deconfinement transition in QCD at finite temperature. When a phase transition is present the infinite volume extrapolation can hardly be smooth. The 1+1 dimensional Gross-Neveu model in the large- $N$  limit provides a perfect example for illustrating the problem.

Since  $M = \Lambda_{\overline{\text{MS}}}$  is the only dimensionful parameter, the transition point  $L_c$  is of order one in units of  $1/M$  when  $\theta = 0$ . This transition is of course the same as the finite temperature phase transition. From Fig.1 we see that the entire regime of finite mass gap is located in the non-perturbative region, where the perturbative running coupling is very large or divergent, as exemplified by the first order (dotted line) and second order (dashed line) perturbative results, respectively. When the size of the box  $L$  is smaller than  $L_c$ , chiral symmetry forbids the mass gap generation. Hence the small-volume expansion in the most naive form does not work at all. However, as we have shown, we can delay the phase transition to an arbitrary point by varying the relevant boundary condition. This widens the window in which the mass gap curve overlaps with the perturbative regime. More concretely, let us examine the mass gap behavior near the bosonic limit. To order  $(\theta - 1/2)^2$  the mass gap equation is

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{ML}\right) + \ln 4\pi - \gamma_E = \left(4(\theta - 1/2)^2 + \frac{m(L, \theta)^2 L^2}{\pi^2}\right)^{-1/2}, \quad (14)$$

which yields, in the region of  $|\theta - 1/2| < g^2(L)/2\pi$ ,

$$m(L, \theta) = \frac{g^2(L)}{L} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\pi^2(\theta - 1/2)^2}{g^2(L)}}, \quad (15)$$

where  $g^2(L) = \pi/\ln(4\pi e^{-\gamma_E}/ML)$  is the perturbative running coupling constant. The critical region is then shifted to  $g^2(L) \sim |\theta - 1/2|$ . Thus, close to the bosonic limit  $\theta = 1/2$ , the mass gap curve possesses a big region in which a perturbative calculation can be carried out. At the very value of  $\theta = 1/2$  the gap equation Eq.(10) becomes identical to that of the non-linear  $\sigma$ -model in the large- $N$  limit [7]. In practice, some intermediate values of  $\theta$  may be optimal to make the curve flat enough for a better extrapolation, though the choice of  $\theta$  would only be known *a posteriori*. Using more general boundary conditions, such as twisted boundary conditions [10], to improve the convergence in the Yang-Mills gauge theory have been pursued [11].

Strictly speaking, the analogy with finite temperature phase transitions is no longer valid when more than one spatial directions are compactified. However, even in these cases, rapid cross-overs are still expected, though there would be no true singularities, which only associate with phase transitions.

We would like to mention in passing that the phase transition in the 1+1 dimensional Gross-Neveu model with a finite  $L$  is no longer possible when  $N$  is finite due to the existence of the  $\sigma$ -kinks, as shown in Ref. [12]. For this reason we will not dwell further into details on the thermodynamical observables in the 1+1 dimensional case. However, since this absence of the phase transition is invisible in the large- $N$  expansion to any finite order, the results we found above are entirely legitimate within the domain of the  $1/N$  expansion. As we will show in the next section, qualitatively similar results are obtained in the 2+1 dimensional Gross-Neveu model, where a phase transition can exist for an infinitely long cylinder (but with finite circumference  $L$ ) at zero temperature.

### III. RESULTS IN 2+1 DIMENSIONS

The effective potential for the  $\sigma$ -field in 2+1 dimensions to leading order in  $1/N$  has a similar form as Eq.(5)

$$V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta] = N \left[ \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon} \sigma^2}{2g_B^2} - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu^{2\epsilon} \int \frac{d^{2-2\epsilon} \omega}{(2\pi)^{2-2\epsilon}} \ln(\omega^2 + \tilde{k}_n^2 + \sigma^2) \right]. \quad (16)$$

Again we first calculate the derivative of  $V_{\text{eff}}$  with respect to  $\sigma$ . After some standard manipulation we obtain

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta]}{\partial \sigma} = N \sigma \left[ \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon}}{g_B^2} + \frac{1}{2\pi L} \ln(4 \cos^2 \pi \theta) + \frac{1}{2\pi L} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} C_{2\nu}(\theta) (\sigma L)^{2\nu} \right], \quad (17)$$

where

$$C_{2\nu}(\theta) = \frac{(-1)^{\nu+1}}{\nu} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{2\nu} \left[ \zeta(2\nu, 1/2 + \theta) + \zeta(2\nu, 1/2 - \theta) \right]. \quad (18)$$

Due to the use of dimensional regularization we do not encounter infinities here. However, in order for the theory to possess spontaneous parity breaking in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  we demand, as in Ref. [13],

$$\frac{\mu^{2\epsilon}}{g_B^2} = -\frac{M}{2\pi}. \quad (19)$$

$M$  will turn out to be the dynamical mass of the particle in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . We want to remind the reader that in 2+1 dimensions  $g_B^2$  has the dimension of inverse mass. If we further use the infinite product representation of

$$\cosh z - \cos 2\pi\alpha = 2 \sin^2 \pi\alpha \left(1 + \frac{z^2}{4\pi^2\alpha^2}\right) \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{z^2}{4\pi^2(k+\alpha)^2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{z^2}{4\pi^2(k-\alpha)^2}\right), \quad (20)$$

the series in Eq.(17) can be summed into a closed form

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}[\sigma, \theta]}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{N\sigma}{2\pi} \left[ -M + \frac{1}{L} \ln(2 \cosh \sigma L + 2 \cos 2\pi\theta) \right]. \quad (21)$$

The mass gap is immediately solved from  $\partial V_{\text{eff}}(\sigma = m)/\partial \sigma = 0$ ,

$$m(L, \theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{L} \cosh^{-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} (e^{ML} - e^{ML_c(\theta)}) \right], & \text{when } L > L_c(\theta), \\ 0, & \text{when } L < L_c(\theta), \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

where the critical length  $L_c(\theta)$  is defined by

$$L_c(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{when } \theta \in (1/3, 2/3), \\ \frac{1}{M} \ln(4 \cos^2 \pi\theta), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

The free energy, equal to the effective potential evaluated at  $\sigma = m(L, \theta)$ , has the form

$$F[L, \theta] = \frac{N}{2\pi} \left[ -\frac{M}{2} m^2(L, \theta) + \frac{1}{L} \int_0^{m(L, \theta)} d\sigma \sigma \ln(2 \cosh \sigma L + 2 \cos 2\pi\theta) \right]. \quad (24)$$

For convenience from the experimental point of view we would like to regard  $\theta$ , rather than  $1/L$ , as the independent variable, because one could use the same sample and only change the magnetic field strength in the solenoid. In Fig.2 we display the mass gap as a function of  $\theta$  for three values of  $1/L$ . The distinct feature in the figure is the non-analyticity of  $m(L, \theta)$  as a function of  $\theta$  when  $L \leq L_c(0)$ , reflecting the fact that the Aharonov-Bohm effect pushes the critical length of the phase transition to a smaller value or effectively changes the mass scale of the theory to a larger value. In Fig.3 we plot the phase diagram in the  $(1/L, \theta)$ -plane determined from Eq.(22). We not only find the change of the critical length as  $\theta$  is varied, we also find, surprisingly, that there is a region  $\theta \in (1/3, 2/3)$  where parity is always broken, no matter how small  $L$  is. In other words, even when the renormalized mass scale  $M = 0$ , the system would still prefer to stay in the parity breaking phase for  $\theta \in (1/3, 2/3)$ .

To understand why there should be such a region of  $\theta$  where parity is always broken, let us focus on the  $\sigma$ -propagator. We know from the literature [13] that the mechanism of parity

breaking at zero temperature (corresponding to  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\theta = 0$  in our case) is due to the formation of a quasi-bound state, which shows up as a “pole” at the fermion-antifermion threshold,  $\omega^2 = 4M^2$ . It is this quasi-bound state, analogous to the Cooper-pair in an usual superconductor, that condenses and renders the expectation value  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$  non-vanishing. By an explicit calculation of the  $\sigma$ -propagator, we can show that this quasi-bound state persists whenever the mass gap  $m(L, \theta)$  is finite. Therefore the mechanism for parity breaking is the same when  $\theta \in (1/3, 2/3)$  as when  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\theta = 0$ . Since the threshold becomes zero in the symmetric phase due to the vanishing mass gap, all states have to lie within the continuum and hence there can not be any bound state. One can easily verify that  $\omega^2 = 0$  is no longer a pole for the  $\sigma$ -propagator in the symmetric phase.

Qualitatively, the symmetric phase is a kinetic energy dominated phase, while the symmetry breaking phase is the interaction dominated phase. When the size of the cylinder  $L$  becomes smaller, the kinetic energy becomes more and more important, if none of the discrete momentum levels vanish. In our case the effective momentum is  $\tilde{k}_n = \pi(2n + 1 + \theta)/L$ , which interpolates between the fermionic and bosonic cases. When  $\theta$  is finite, one of the  $\tilde{k}_n$  is closer to zero and thus the role of the kinetic energy is reduced. This in turn implies that, effectively, the interaction becomes stronger when  $\theta$  increases from the fermionic value 0 to the bosonic value  $1/2$ . We will show, in section V, that the presence of  $\theta$  indeed modifies the phase acquired when interchanging two particles, from the original fermionic value,  $\pi$ , to  $\pi + 2\pi\theta$ . This extra phase could be interpreted as an additional contact interaction. One such example in the context of non-relativistic quantum mechanics was noticed some time ago by Leinaas and Myrheim [14].

Another physical observable is the induced (or persistent) surface current density circling around the cylinder, defined by

$$J[L, \theta] \equiv -\frac{\partial F[L, \theta]}{\partial a_1} = -\frac{L}{2\pi} \frac{\partial F[L, \theta]}{\partial \theta} = \frac{N \sin 2\pi\theta}{2\pi L^2} \int_0^{m(L, \theta)L} dx \frac{x}{\cosh x + \cos 2\pi\theta}. \quad (25)$$

One can easily recognize that the overall factor  $\sin 2\pi\theta$  in the above equation has the same origin as a similar factor in the Aharonov-Bohm scattering amplitude [3]. This overall factor implies that the induced current vanishes at the fermion and boson limits or when  $\theta$  is integer or half integer, in analogy to the vanishing of the Aharonov-Bohm scattering cross section in the same limits. A similar induced current on a ring was derived in terms of a single particle picture in Ref. [15] more than a decade ago. What is novel in our case is that  $m(L, \theta)$  is a dynamically determined quantity, due to many-body effects, rather than an external parameter. In Fig.4 we plot  $J[L, \theta]$  as a function of  $\theta$  for several values of  $1/L$ . Again we observe the non-analyticity, inherent from the non-analyticity of  $m(L, \theta)$ .

Expanding the free energy in Eq.(24) as a power series in  $m(L, \theta)L$ , we obtain

$$F[L, \theta] = \frac{Nm(L, \theta)^2}{4\pi} \left[ -M + \frac{1}{L} \ln(4 \cos^2 \pi\theta) + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \overline{C}_{2\nu}(\theta) (m(L, \theta)L)^{2\nu} \right], \quad (26)$$

with

$$\overline{C}_{2\nu}(\theta) = \frac{(-1)^{\nu+1}}{\nu(\nu+1)} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{2\nu} \left[ \zeta(2\nu, 1/2 + \theta) + \zeta(2\nu, 1/2 - \theta) \right]. \quad (27)$$



This expression for  $F[L, \theta]$  can be interpreted as a virial expansion, in analogy to the expansion of pressure as a power series in the particle density. The corresponding virial coefficients are  $\overline{C}_{2\nu}(\theta)$ , which become singular when  $\theta = 1/2$ , since  $\zeta(\alpha, z) \sim z^{-\alpha}$  when  $z$  is small enough.

We will show in section V that  $\theta$  plays the role of the statistics parameter, with  $\theta = 0$  being the fermionic limit and  $\theta = 1/2$  being the bosonic limit. The divergence of the virial coefficients at  $\theta = 1/2$  apparently reflects the fact that it is not possible to use a single series to represent the free energy with all the coefficients smoothly interpolating between the fermionic and bosonic regimes, even though both regimes are well behaved by themselves. Put differently, the fermionic regime and bosonic regime are separated by non-perturbative physics (in terms of the statistics parameter). A much milder singularity (cusp) is found for the second virial coefficient in the non-relativistic anyon system considered by Arovas, Schrieffer, Wilczek and Zee [16]. One may speculate that the stronger singularity we find is rooted in the deep connection between statistics and spin in fully relativistic theories. It is worth emphasizing again that the non-analyticity is a manifestation of the Aharonov-Bohm effect in an infinite many-particle system. Without a phase transition, the  $\theta$  dependence of physical observables would never be singular.

#### IV. UNIVERSALITY

In the last two sections we found that many thermodynamical observables are strongly influenced by the Aharonov-Bohm effect. In order to reveal the precise influence of the Aharonov-Bohm effect on the phase transition we calculate the critical exponents in this section. It turns out that if we fix  $\theta$  and vary  $1/L$ , in analogy to the usual variation of temperature, the universalities of the chiral restoration in the 1+1 dimensional case and parity restoration in the 2+1 dimensional case are not altered by the presence of  $\theta$  to leading order in  $1/N$ , as long as the phase transition is not totally destroyed. Since the calculation process is insensitive to the space-time dimensions involved, we will only present the calculation in the case of 2+1 dimensions. For notational simplicity let us define  $\tau \equiv [L - L_c(\theta)]/L_c(\theta)$ , with  $L_c(\theta)$  given by Eq.(23). For detailed definitions of the critical exponents we refer to the book [17]. Because the phase transition exists when  $\theta \in [0, 1/3)$  and  $\theta \in (2/3, 1]$ , the critical exponents are defined only in these regions in 2+1 dimensions.

From Eq.(22) we can immediately solve for the mass gap  $m(L, \theta)$ , for small  $\tau > 0$ ,

$$m(L, \theta) \approx \frac{M}{\sqrt{\ln(4 \cos^2 \pi \theta)}} \tau^{1/2}, \quad (28)$$

which in turn yields  $\beta = 1/2$ .

The free energy clearly vanishes in the symmetric phase when  $L < L_c(\theta)$ , since  $m(L, \theta) = 0$  there. In the symmetry breaking phase the free energy is given, as can be seen directly from Eq.(24), by

$$F[L, \theta] \approx \frac{Nm(L, \theta)^2}{4\pi} \left[ -M + \frac{L_c(\theta)}{L} M + \overline{C}_2(\theta) (m(L, \theta)L)^2 \right] = -\frac{NM^3}{4\pi} \frac{1 - \overline{C}_2(\theta)}{\ln(4 \cos^2 \pi \theta)} \tau^2, \quad (29)$$

with  $\overline{C}_2(\theta) = 1/8 \cos^2 \pi\theta$ . The specific heat  $c_v$  is proportional to the second derivative of  $F[L, \theta]$  with respect to  $\tau$ . Thus we see that  $c_v$  is finite in both phases and has a discontinuity at the critical point, which implies that  $\alpha = \alpha' = 0$ .

To obtain the exponents  $\gamma$ ,  $\nu$  and  $\eta$  we need to calculate the two-point correlation function for the  $\sigma$ -field in momentum space in the “static” limit,  $D_\sigma(\omega = 0, \mathbf{p})$ . Here  $\omega$  should be understood as the momentum in the  $x$ -direction and  $\mathbf{p}$  represents the momenta along the Euclidean time and  $y$ -direction, respectively. To leading order in  $1/N$  this correlation function is given by simple iteration of the bubble graph. After some lengthy but straightforward calculation we obtain, to order  $\mathbf{p}^2$ ,

$$D_\sigma(\omega = 0, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{\pi}{N} \left[ \frac{\overline{C}_2(\theta) L_c(\theta)}{2} \mathbf{p}^2 + aM\tau \right]^{-1}, \quad (30)$$

where  $a = 1$  when  $\tau > 0$  and  $a = -1/2$  when  $\tau < 0$ . At the criticality, or  $\tau = 0$ ,  $D_\sigma(\omega = 0, \mathbf{p}) \propto \mathbf{p}^{-2}$ , which implies  $\eta = 0$ . The susceptibility  $\chi$  is proportional to  $D_\sigma(\omega = 0, \mathbf{p} = 0) \propto \tau^{-1}$  in both phases. Thus, we have  $\gamma = \gamma' = 1$ . Eq.(30) also implies that the correlation length  $\xi$  has the form

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{\overline{C}_2(\theta) L_c(\theta)}{2aM}} |\tau|^{-1/2}, \quad (31)$$

or equivalently  $\nu = \nu' = 1/2$ .

In order to obtain the last exponent  $\delta$  we need to introduce an uniform external field  $h$  coupled linearly to  $\bar{\psi}\psi$  (or a mass term). In the presence of  $h$  the gap equation to leading order in  $1/N$  is still given by Eq.(17) except for the replacement  $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma + h$  in the one-loop part. As a consequence of this replacement the gap equation now becomes

$$m \left\{ \tau + \frac{1}{ML_c(\theta)} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} C_{2\nu}(\theta) (m(L, \theta)L)^{2\nu} \right\} = h. \quad (32)$$

At the critical point we have  $m^3 \propto h$ , or in other words,  $\delta = 3$ .

This completes the calculation of the exponents in 2+1 dimensions. The same result was obtained in Ref. [18] for  $\theta = 0$ . One obtains identical exponents by a similar calculation in 1+1 dimensions. We summarize the final result in Table I. It hardly escapes notice that the exponents in Table I are of the mean-field type. This does not constitute a surprise since we only work up to the leading order in  $1/N$ . However, one should be aware that the large- $N$  limit alone does not guarantee a mean-field result. For example, the non-linear  $\sigma$ -model in lower than 4 dimensions violates mean-field universality even in leading order in  $1/N$  [17]. The real reason in our case is that no  $\sigma$ -loop contribution is involved to leading order in  $1/N$ . Of course, we anticipate that the degeneracy of the critical exponents in 1+1 and 2+1 dimensions is lifted when we include higher order corrections. It perhaps should be mentioned explicitly that, though the critical exponents are independent of  $\theta$ , the amplitudes do depend on  $\theta$ .

Finally, we would like to point out that, if we regard  $\theta$  as the independent variable and fix  $1/L$ , we find that the functional dependence on  $\theta$  of some physical observables, such as the mass gap and the induced current, near the critical region depends on the value of  $1/L$ , as explicitly indicated in Fig.2 and Fig.4, with  $L = L_c(0)$  as a special point.

## V. THE NATURE OF THE QUASI-PARTICLE

Since the interactions between quasi-particles are of the order  $1/N$ , which is vanishingly small in the large  $N$  limit, we are allowed to discard the interaction all together when we attempt to elucidate the nature of the quasi-particle. The effective Lagrangian is simply given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \bar{\psi}[i\partial_\mu - a_\mu(\theta)]\gamma^\mu\psi - m\bar{\psi}\psi, \quad (33)$$

with  $m = m(L, \theta)$  and  $\psi(x + L) = -\psi(x)$ . The constant gauge field can be eliminated by a gauge transformation, as mentioned in the Introduction, at the expense of the  $\psi$ -field becoming multi-valued when  $\theta \neq 0$  or  $1/2$ . This multi-valuedness signals that the quasi-particle is anyon-like.

To be more specific, let us calculate the propagator for the  $\psi$ -field, which can be easily written down in momentum space as

$$\tilde{S}(k_n, \omega; \theta) = i \frac{\omega\gamma_0 - \tilde{k}_n\gamma_1 + m}{\omega^2 - \tilde{k}_n^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon}. \quad (34)$$

The propagator in coordinate space is then obtained by a Fourier transform

$$S(x, t; \theta) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{i(\omega t - k_n x)} \tilde{S}(k_n, \omega; \theta) = [(i\partial_\mu - a_\mu(\theta))\gamma^\mu + m]S_0(x, t; \theta), \quad (35)$$

where  $S_0(x, t; \theta)$  is the “bosonic” propagator

$$S_0(x, t; \theta) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ik_n x} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{i\omega t} \frac{i}{\omega^2 - \tilde{k}_n^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon}, \quad (36)$$

$$= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ik_n x} \frac{1}{2E_n} [\theta(t)e^{-iE_n t} + \theta(-t)e^{iE_n t}], \quad (37)$$

and  $E_n = \sqrt{\tilde{k}_n^2 + m^2}$ . To carry out the discrete momentum sum we use the Poisson summation formula

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} f(n) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\phi e^{-i2\pi l\phi} f(\phi). \quad (38)$$

It is then straightforward, following the procedure in [19], to obtain

$$S_0(x, t; \theta) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\pi l} e^{i2\pi(l+x/L)\theta} S_B(x + lL, t), \quad (39)$$

where  $S_B(x, t)$  is given by

$$S_B(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \theta(x^2 - t^2) K_0(m\sqrt{x^2 - t^2}) - i\frac{1}{4} \theta(t^2 - x^2) H_0^{(2)}(m\sqrt{t^2 - x^2}). \quad (40)$$

In the above equation  $t$  should be understood as  $t(1 - i\epsilon) \equiv t - i\epsilon \text{sign}(t)$  or equivalently  $t^2 \rightarrow t^2 - i\epsilon$ , to avoid divergences on the light-cone.

The physical meaning of each term in  $S_0(x, t; \theta)$  can be easily recognized. The “ $l$ ” sum is obviously a sum over winding numbers. The first factor is due to the anti-periodic boundary condition. The second factor accounts for the total flux embraced by a quasi-particle with a path which winds around the origin “ $l$ ” times. The third factor is nothing but the relativistic boson propagator in flat 1+1 dimensional Minkowski space from point  $x_i = (0, 0)$  to point  $x_f = (x + lL, t)$ . Therefore, the above equation is a decomposition of  $S_0(x, t; \theta)$  into a sum over paths of distinct homotopy class in the universal covering space with  $\theta$  taking the role of the statistics parameter. In the limit  $L \gg t$  all terms except  $l = 0$  are exponentially (or algebraically when  $m = 0$ ) suppressed and  $S(x, t; \theta)$  approaches the usual boson propagator.

The interpretation of  $\theta$  as the statistics parameter can be also understood from the point of view of interchanging a pair of quasi-particles. Since these quasi-particles can not penetrate through each other due to the hard core (inherent from the fermionic Lagrangian when  $\theta = 0$ ), the only way to interchange the positions of quasi-particle number 1 located at  $x_1 = 0$  and quasi-particle number 2 at  $x_2 = x$  is to let quasi-particle 1 travel through the interval  $(0, x)$ , while quasi-particle 2 travels through the interval  $(x, L)$  and then  $(L := 0, x)$ . The combined world line exactly circumscribes the ring once and therefore accumulates a phase factor

$$\exp\left\{i \oint dx^\mu a_\mu(\theta)\right\} = e^{i2\pi\theta}. \quad (41)$$

In possession of the explicit expression for  $S(x, t; \theta)$  we can use the Bjorken-Johnson-Low formula [20] to calculate the equal-time anti-commutation relation

$$\{\psi_\alpha(x, 0), \psi_\beta^\dagger(0, 0)\} = \left(\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} S(x, t; \theta)\gamma_0 - \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} S(x, t; \theta)\gamma_0\right)_{\alpha\beta} \quad (42)$$

and see whether the usual anti-commutator is affected by the presence of the magnetic flux. It is readily verified that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} S(x, t(1 - i\epsilon); \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(t) \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^l \delta(x + lL) \gamma_0 + \text{terms independent of } t, \quad (43)$$

which in turn yields

$$\{\psi_\alpha(x, 0), \psi_\beta^\dagger(0, 0)\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^l \delta(x + lL). \quad (44)$$

While the sum over “ $l$ ” is again due to the geometry of the ring, we have verified that  $\theta$  does not enter the canonical equal-time anti-commutator in our model, in contrast to the graded commutator obeyed by anyons induced via the Chern-Simons action. This result should not be surprising in light of the local character of the canonical commutation relation and the fact that the magnetic flux is global and never attached to each particle in our model. On the other hand, the propagator contains global information and should have a non-trivial  $\theta$ -dependence, which in turn yields the non-trivial dependence on  $\theta$  of thermodynamical

quantities. Thus, the nature of the quasi-particle now becomes clear. Locally, the quasi-particle is a fermion, but globally, the quasi-particle behaves like an anyon.

Similarly, the propagator in 2+1 dimensions can be calculated and is again given by Eq.(35) except that  $S_0(x, t; \theta)$  in Eq.(39) should be replaced by the 2+1 dimensional version

$$S_0(x, y, t; \theta) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\pi l} e^{i2\pi(l+x/L)\theta} S_B(x + lL, y, t), \quad (45)$$

with

$$S_B(x, y, t; \theta) = \theta(r^2 - t^2) \frac{e^{-m\sqrt{r^2 - t^2}}}{4\pi\sqrt{r^2 - t^2}} - i\theta(t^2 - r^2) \frac{e^{-im\sqrt{t^2 - r^2}}}{4\pi\sqrt{t^2 - r^2}}, \quad (46)$$

and  $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ . Using the identity

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\epsilon}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^{3/2}} = 2\pi\delta(x)\delta(y), \quad (47)$$

the anti-commutator in 2+1 dimensions is then given by

$$\{\psi_\alpha(x, y, t), \psi_\beta^\dagger(0, 0, t)\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^l \delta(x + lL) \delta(y). \quad (48)$$

It is not difficult to see that the quasi-particle in the 2+1 dimensional case is anyon-like only in the  $x$  direction. In other words, only those world lines which circumscribe the axis of the cylinder non-trivially can acquire phases of integer multiples of  $2\pi\theta$ .

## VI. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

We considered the statistical mechanics of the Gross-Neveu model on a ring and on a cylinder with a magnetic solenoid coinciding with the axis. Among the interesting results we obtained are 1) the periodic but non-analytic dependence of thermodynamical observables on the magnetic flux ( $\theta$ ) and 2) the existence of an interval of  $\theta \in (1/3, 2/3)$  (modulo integers) where parity is always spontaneously broken. All these phenomena are explicit manifestations of the Aharonov-Bohm effect in thermodynamics or in many-body systems. We further showed that the mean-field nature of the existing phase transitions is preserved to leading order in  $1/N$ , by verifying the  $\theta$ -independence of all the critical exponents. The precise nature of the quasi-particle, locally fermion-like and globally anyon-like, was illuminated through the calculation of the equal-time commutator and the decomposition of the propagator into a sum over paths of distinct homotopy class or winding number.

There are several directions in which our present work can be extended within the same model. The most interesting one is to include an external space-time dependent electromagnetic field and study the response to it. To set up junctions and investigate tunnelings and interferences could also be interesting. Although we only worked to leading order in  $1/N$ , we do expect that our results, especially in the 2+1 dimensional case, are qualitatively stable against higher order  $1/N$ -corrections, based on the next to leading order study of the same

model in Ref. [21] in the absence of  $\theta$ . Nevertheless, an explicit calculation of the higher order corrections should be carried out. One may also try to introduce a chemical potential and study the situation away from the half-filling point.

As we have been emphasizing all along, the periodic but non-analytic  $\theta$ -dependence of thermodynamical observables is a manifestation of the Aharonov-Bohm effect in many-body systems with phase transitions, not necessarily pertinent only to the Gross-Neveu model itself. For this reason we anticipate that similar phenomena can be found in other models. The detailed microscopic interactions are likely to play minor role, as long as phase transitions exist. Thus, in order to make direct contact with experimental verification, it would be very interesting to consider more realistic models.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin, *The Quantum Hall Effect* (Springer, New York, 1987);  
A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, *Geometric Phases in Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989)
- [2] F. Wilczek, *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990)
- [3] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.* 115 (1959) 485
- [4] D. J. Gross and A. Neveu, *Phys. Rev. D* 10 (1974) 3235
- [5] E. Fradkin, *Field Theories of Condensed Matter Systems* (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1991) chapter 4
- [6] X. G. Wen, F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. B* 39 (1989) 11413
- [7] M. Lüscher, *Phys. Letters B* 118 (1982) 391
- [8] M. Lüscher, *Nucl. Phys. B* 219 (1983) 233
- [9] P. van Baal and A. S. Kronfeld, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* 9 (1989) 227;  
H. Hansson, P. van Baal and I. Zahed, *Nucl. Phys. B* 289 (1987) 628;  
J. Koller and P. van Baal, *Nucl. Phys. B* 302 (1988) 1
- [10] G. 't Hooft, *Nucl. Phys. B* 153 (1979) 141
- [11] A. Coste, A. Gonzalez-Arroyo, C. P. Korthals-Altes, B. Söderberg and A. Tarancon, *Nucl. Phys. B* 287 (1987) 569;  
M. Garcia Perez, A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and P. Martinez, preprints INLO-PUB-18/93, FTUAM-93/40 (1993)
- [12] R. F. Dashen, S. K. Ma and R. Rajaraman, *Phys. Rev. D* 11 (1975) 1499
- [13] B. Rosenstein, B. J. Warr and S. H. Park, *Phys. Rep.* 205 (1991) 59
- [14] J. M. Leinaas and J. Myrheim, *Il Nuovo Cimento* 37B (1977) 1
- [15] C. C. Gerry and V. A. Singh, *Il Nuovo Cimento* 73B (1983) 161
- [16] D. Arovas, J. R. Schrieffer, F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Nucl. Phys. B* 251 (1985) 117
- [17] C. Itzykson and J.-M. Drouffe, *Statistical Field Theory* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989)
- [18] B. Rosenstein, B. J. Warr and S. H. Park, *Phys. Rev. D* 39 (1989) 3088
- [19] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, *An Introduction to Theory of Quantized Fields* (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1959)
- [20] J. D. Bjorken, *Phys. Rev.* 148 (1966) 1467;  
K. Johnson and F. E. Low, *Prog. Theor. Phys. (Kyoto) Supp.* 37-38 (1966) 74
- [21] G. Gat, A. Kovner, B. Rosenstein and B. J. Warr, *Phys. Lett. B* 240 (1990) 158

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. Mass gap  $m(L, \theta)$  (in units of  $M$ ) as a function of  $1/L$  for  $\theta = 0$  (fermion limit), 0.3, 0.4 and  $1/2$  (boson limit) in the 1+1 dimensional Gross-Neveu model. Also plotted are the first order (dotted line) and second order (dashed line) perturbative results. The sudden turns of the dotted and dashed lines for small values of  $1/L$  reflect the fact that the perturbative running coupling diverges at  $L = 4L_c(0)$ .

FIG. 2. Mass gap  $m(L, \theta)$  as a function of  $\theta$  for  $L = 1$ ,  $L = L_c(0) = \ln 4$  and  $L = 2$  (in units of  $M$ ). The functional form of the  $\theta$ -dependence of  $m(L, \theta)$  in relevant regions is also indicated explicitly.

FIG. 3. Phase diagram in  $(1/L, \theta)$ -plane (with  $M = 1$ ). In the interval of  $\theta \in (1/3, 2/3)$  the system is always in the parity broken phase, independent of the value of  $1/L$ .

FIG. 4. Induced current  $J[L, \theta]$  as a function of  $\theta$  for  $L = 1$ ,  $L = L_c(0) = \ln 4$  and  $L = 2$  (with  $M = 1$ ). The functional form of the  $\theta$ -dependence of  $J[L, \theta]$  in relevant regions is also indicated explicitly.



# TABLES

TABLE I. critical exponents

|                                            | $\alpha$ | $\alpha'$ | $\beta$ | $\gamma$ | $\gamma'$ | $\delta$ | $\nu$ | $\nu'$ | $\eta$ |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|--------|
| D=1+1, $\theta \in [0, 1/2)$ or $(1/2, 1]$ | 0        | 0         | 1/2     | 1        | 1         | 3        | 1/2   | 1/2    | 0      |
| D=2+1, $\theta \in [0, 1/3)$ or $(2/3, 1]$ | 0        | 0         | 1/2     | 1        | 1         | 3        | 1/2   | 1/2    | 0      |